



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,599	12/17/2003	Yumi Shibata	117961	5840
25944	7590	08/22/2007	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			LONG, ANDREA NATAE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2176		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/22/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/736,599	SHIBATA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrea N. Long	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

FINAL ACTION

Applicant's Response

1. Claims 1-8 and 11-15 were amended, claims 9-10 were cancelled, and claim 16 was added. Claims 1-8 and 11-16 are currently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ota Takeshi (JP 2000-337911, published 08-12-2000), hereinafter “Takeshi”.**

In regard to independent claim 1,

Takeshi teaches *an information display system, comprising:*

a display that displays a web page (paragraph [0002] [0005] → taught as a display in a car navigation system that is enabled to see the web page of the Internet);

an information extractor that extracts:

a telephone number from the displayed web page; and

an address from the displayed webpage (paragraph [0032] [0042] [0043] → taught as an extract section that extracts character strings such as an address and telephone number from a web page);

a search unit that searches for a facility corresponding to the extracted telephone number based on a result of the comparison (paragraph [0043] [0044] → taught as the passing of the address and telephone number to a server which searches the location of that location);

a facility information registration unit that registers facility information for the search facility, the information including a position of the searched facility (paragraph [0059] → taught as a database that is searched to obtain positional information); and

a facility information storage unit that stores the registered facility information (paragraph [0063] [0064] → taught as a database that stores information about various locations including positional information). While Takeshi does not explicitly teach a comparison unit that compares an address corresponding to the extracted telephone number with the extracted address, Takeshi does teach were a server searches for a location based on extracted information such as a telephone number and address and discussed above. It is reasonably suggestive to one skilled in the art that a comparison of information extracted from the web page is being compared to information within a database, in order for the positional information to be obtained a match would have to be located. Therefore one skilled in the art can conclude that information such as the address or telephone number would be present in the database for which the extracted address and telephone would be compared to. Having such a comparison present in Takeshi invention would provide a verification that the information in the system is updated or would provide an alert for information that is conflicting.

In regard to dependent claims 2 and 3,

the limitations of *the display a server including the information extractor, the search unit, the facility information registration unit, and the facility storage unit* have been address in independent claim 1. In addition Takeshi teaches a *transmitter/receiver unit* (paragraph [0060]).

4. **Claims 4-5, 11-13, and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeshi in view of Obradovich et al (PG Pub US 2002/0013815 A1), herein after “Obradovich”.**

In regard to dependent claim 4,

note the discussion above in claim 1, Takeshi teaches an information display system with a comparison unit that compares the address corresponding to the extracted address. However, Takeshi does not explicitly teach were the comparison is used to determine if they address are consistent and if they are consistent, the search unit searches for the facility corresponding to the extracted telephone number. Obradovich teaches wherein a search with search criteria is performed to locate a facility that is consistent with the search criteria. The matching results are provided to the user [page 3 paragraph [0041]].

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the comparing of information of Takeshi with the testing of consistency of Obradovich to restrict the amount of unwanted information that could be received.

In regard to dependent claims 5 and 11-13,

Takeshi teaches an information display system that includes facility information. Takeshi does not teach wherein the facility information includes a schedule in terms of a scheduled date/time. Obradovich teaches *wherein the facility information includes a schedule in terms of a scheduled date/time* (page 4 paragraph [0049], calendar).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have included schedule information to provide additional assistance when determining routing of locations.

In regard to dependent claim 16,

Takeshi teaches an information display system that extracts information such as a address and telephone number from a web page associated with a location (paragraph [0042]). Takeshi does not teach *wherein a list of candidates for facilities is generated and displayed on the display a plurality of address or telephone numbers of facilities are indicated on the web page.*

Obradovich teaches wherein multiple results can be provided to a user based on a search criteria. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have a list of results displayed to a user based on multiple criteria, which can include telephone numbers and addresses, to provide a extensive yet relevant list of potential locations of interest to a user.

5. **Claims 6-8 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeshi in view of Obradovich in further view of Tognazzini (US Patent 5790974), hereinafter “Tognazzini”.**

In regard to dependent claim 6,

Takeshi teaches an information display system. However, Takeshi does not teach a schedule or advance notification of facility information. Obradovich teaches a schedule (calendar). Tognazzini teaches *wherein a notification of the facility information is given in advance* (column 1 lines 58-62, column 7 lines 3-9).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the information display system of Takeshi with the calendar of Obradovich with the notification system of Tognazzini to inform the user of varying conditions affecting a user's schedule (column 1 lines 50-53).

In regard to dependent claims 7 and 14,

Takeshi teaches an information display system. However, Takeshi does not teach deleting a schedule when it expires. Obradovich teaches a schedule. Tognazzini teaches *wherein the schedule is deleted when the scheduled date/time expires* (column 9 lines 9-21).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the information display system of Takeshi with the calendar of Obradovich with the deleting of Tognazzini to allow a user to delete conflicting entries due to varying conditions which can affect a user's schedule (column 1 lines 50-53).

In regard to dependent claims 8 and 15,

Takeshi teaches an information display system. However, Takeshi does not teach updating a schedule. Obradovich teaches a schedule. Tognazzini teaches *wherein the schedule is updated when the scheduled date/time expires* (column 1 lines 54-57).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the information display system of Takeshi with the calendar of Obradovich with the updating of Tognazzini to allow a user to update conflicting entries due to varying conditions which can affect a user's schedule (column 1 lines 50-53).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as necessitated by the amendment. The amendment changes the scope of the claim when interpreted as a whole.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea N. Long whose telephone number is 571-270-1055. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs 6:00 am to 3:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Andrea Long
August 15, 2007

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER